UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,330	12/23/2005	Andreas Schilling	1093-145 PCT/US	5691
Charles R Hoffi	7590 09/16/200 nann	EXAMINER		
Hoffmann & Ba		PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L		
6900 Jericho Tu Syosset, NY 11		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2872	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/562,330	SCHILLING ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOSHUA L. PRITCHETT	2872		

	JOSHUA L. PRITCHETT	2872	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete 	liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed off A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NOT		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	1 1 1161 (1	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		_	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-21 and 23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22 and 24-26.		l be entered and an ex	κplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/Joshua L Pritchett/		
	Primary Examiner		
	Art I Init: 2872		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues it cannot reasonably be said varying the modulation of a pattern is the same as selecting a phase displacement of the parameter variation function between the pattern region and the background region in accordance with a contrast to be set. Applicant fails to provide supporting reasoning for the assertion therefore the argument is not persuasive. Further the contrast set by the element would be a function of the structure created and therefore any variation in the phase displacement would act to set a contrast. Still further, since contrast is a functional output of the element the limitation cannot be the point of novelty for an apparatus claim (MPEP 2114). Applicant argues the phase displacement of the periodic function defining for example a wavy pattern. The claim language does not include any reference to a wavy pattern. Further the claim language and the specification fail to limit the phase displacement to non-parallel orientation changing. The examiner interpets shifting from a valley to a peak as shown in Lee would fall within the broadest reasonable interpretation of "phase displacement." Applicant argues the waves in the Lee reference continue to run parallel. There is no claim limitation which precludes such a device from satisfying the claim language. Applicant argues the mere fact wave patterns turn from black to white does not mean a parameter variation funciton is phase displaced. The change from black to white in Lee is evidence of the shift in the structure from an expected peak to a valley for visa-a-versa. The examiner interprets this alteration as a phase displacement. The claim language does not limit phase displacement to non-parallel displacments or rotational adjustments and the examiner interprets the changes shown in Lee as within the broadest reasonable interpretation of "phase displacement." Applicant argues the Lee reference produces a different output than the current inveniton. The output of functionality of the apparatus cannot be the point of patentability for an apparatus claim (MPEP 2114). So long as the prior art teaches the claimed structure the apparatus claim is properly rejected in view of the prior art.